## HAFETZ & NECHELES LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

10 EAST 40<sup>TH</sup> STREET, 48<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR NEW YORK, N.Y. 10016 TELEPHONE: (212) 997-7400 TELECOPIER. (212) 997-7646

September 18, 2018

## **VIA ECF**

Honorable Nicholas G. Garaufis United States District Judge Eastern District of New York 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, NY 11201

Re: United States v. Raniere, et al., 18-cr-204 (NGG)

Dear Judge Garaufis:

Yesterday, the government submitted a letter (ECF No. 135) in opposition to Clare Bronfman's request for modification of her bail conditions (ECF No. 126). The only portion that requires a response is the government's disingenuous suggestion, buried in a footnote, that Ms. Bronfman's letter is a "motion for reconsideration" subject to Local Civil Rule 6.3. (ECF No. 135 at 2 n.1). The government's characterization of Ms. Bronfman's letter is plainly wrong, since the Court invited Ms. Bronfman to submit further briefing and stated it would "consider anything [she] ha[s] to say." (Aug. 21, 2018 Tr. 28; see also Tr. 25, 27, 38). Regardless, Rule 6.3 does not apply to bail modification requests. The sole criminal case the government cites is about reconsideration of discovery orders, not bail. See United States v. James, 2007 WL 914242, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 21, 2007). That is because—as we have already explained (see ECF No. 126 at 2)—the Bail Reform Act permits modification of bail orders "at any time," 18 U.S.C. § 3142(c)(3), and courts accordingly review modification requests de novo, with the government retaining the burden of proof, see United States v. Lillemoe, No. 3:15-CR-00025 (JCH), 2015 WL 9694385, at \*1 (D. Conn. May 28, 2015); United States v. Schlegel, No. 06-CR-550, 2008 WL 11338900, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. June 13, 2008). See also United States v. English, 629 F.3d 311, 320 (2d Cir. 2011) (judge may "fully consider" the bail factors on reconsideration and "is not bound by prior rulings").

## HAFETZ & NECHELES LLP

As the government has not meaningfully addressed Ms. Bronfman's arguments, let alone satisfied its burden of proof, the Court should grant Ms. Bronfman's requested modification.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Kathleen E. Cassidy

cc: AUSAs Moira Kim Penza, Tanya Hajjar (via ECF) All defense counsel of record (via ECF)